

The Catholic Record
Published every Friday morning at 42 Richmond Street, over McCallum's Drug Store, and nearly opposite the Post Office.

Annual subscription..... \$2 00
Six months..... 1 00

ADVERTISING RATES.
Twelve and a half cents per line for first insertion. Advertisements measured in non-paired type, 12 lines to an inch, entirely independent of political parties, and exclusively devoted to the cause of the Church and to the promotion of Catholic interests. I am confident that under your experienced management the Record will improve in usefulness and efficiency; and I therefore earnestly commend it to the patronage and encouragement of the clergy and laity of the diocese. Believe me, Yours very sincerely,
THOS. COPPEY,
CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.

London, Ont., May 23, 1879.
DEAR MR. COPPEY.—As you have become proprietor and publisher of the CATHOLIC RECORD, I deem it my duty to announce to its subscribers and patrons that the change of proprietorship will work no change in its tone and principles; that it will remain, what it has been, thoroughly Catholic, entirely independent of political parties, and exclusively devoted to the cause of the Church and to the promotion of Catholic interests. I am confident that under your experienced management the Record will improve in usefulness and efficiency; and I therefore earnestly commend it to the patronage and encouragement of the clergy and laity of the diocese. Believe me,
Yours very sincerely,
+ JOHN WALSH,
Bishop of London.

MR. THOMAS COPPEY,
Office of the "Catholic Record."

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, JAN. 2, 1880.

THE NEW YEAR.

Another year has passed, bearing with it many a care and sorrow, and another looms out before us with its duties to be fulfilled and its cares to be borne. No more fitting time than the beginning of a new year to take a retrospective view, that the light of the past may shine on our path, and bring out into bold relief the shortcomings of our life. Whilst we have had many a care and anxiety in the past twelve months, the hearty words of encouragement we have received from friends have borne us up amid the difficulties of a task on which we must confess we entered with some misgiving. The result of our efforts is consoling indeed. We have received flattering approval from the bishops and priests of God's Church, our friends of the laity have been loud in their encomiums, and we would fain hope that to the bulk of our readers we have given satisfaction. Whilst we have in our humble sphere upheld what appeared to us to be the interests of the church, we have endeavored to give our readers that news which we considered most beneficial to them. As ours is a purely Catholic paper, we have endeavored to gather together the most interesting Catholic news, so that our subscribers may know what their co-religionists are doing outside of the diocese of London. Our articles have been written in a spirit of charity, and we have defended the church against the attacks of enemies kindly but firmly. Still, the RECORD has not yet attained the standard we have proposed to ourselves, and we trust to make it in the course of time a much better and much larger paper. In order to accomplish this, we will need not only the encouragement, but also the material help of our friends. To many of our subscribers we have but words of thankfulness to offer for the prompt manner in which they pay their subscription. To some, however, the payment for a newspaper seems to be a thing of little moment, and by its neglect those in charge are obliged to forego many an improvement that would tend to furnish subscribers with a more readable and a more pleasing paper. We have too vivid a recollection of the fable of the man and the ass to hope to please all, but we conscientiously strive to do our duty as a Catholic journalist, and we trust that in doing so we will please by far the greater number. At this commencement, then, of a New Year, we ask our readers to do their best to help us in our undertaking. Without their aid we will be powerless indeed; and we promise them in return to make the CATHOLIC RECORD, of London, one of the best Catholic papers on the continent. Our sincere thanks are due, and are hereby offered to the Right Rev. Bishop and Rev. Clergy, who have already done so much for us, both by encouragement to ourselves personally and by the kind words in which they have spoken of us to their people. We will strive to be worthy of their patronage. To our subscribers we are also thankful for their support, and wish one and all the very happiest of New Years.

THE INDIANS OF THE NORTH-WEST.

Recent information received from the Northwest shows that the Indians of that vast country have gloomy prospects for the winter. We pointed out some time since what we considered the very best means to assist the aborigines in their present distress, and secure them for the future against starvation.

The Government at Ottawa, no doubt with the very best intentions, sent up last summer a dozen or more of instructors to teach the Indians the science of agriculture. These instructors were appointed on the recommendation of politicians, and cannot, in our opinion, teach that of which they themselves know little or nothing.

We should, however, be glad to hear of their success. In the determination arrived at by the Government, in which we may say we fully concur, to have the Indians instructed in agricultural pursuits, it seems to have been overlooked that the efficient body of Catholic missionaries, who by having devoted their lives to the aboriginal populations, have secured their confidence, are the persons through which that instruction should come. The various missionary stations should be assisted by liberal money grants to provide instruction for the Indians. Here, by the conjoint influence of religion and the vigorous administration of the civil law, the red men would be saved from those moral delinquencies which in their contact with the white man elsewhere, have done so much to decimate their ranks.

This question is one of national importance. We owe it to the new settlers in the Northwest to see that the just claims of the Indians be met in a spirit of liberality. An Indian war in our Northwest would mean the massacre of, perhaps, hundreds of these new settlers and the destruction of numerous rising settlements. It should be averted by wise and energetic action on the part of the administration. If the law does not in its present shape give the government power as full as the case requires, there can be no difficulty in securing the passage of such amendments as may be needed during the approaching session of Parliament.

PRESIDENTIAL PROBABILITIES.

Our republican neighbors are just now discussing the probabilities and even the possibilities of the next Presidential campaign. It is admitted on all sides that the present occupant of the White House must leave it with the expiration of his term, but all are certainly not agreed as to the person who should succeed him.

The republicans are not unanimous in favor of Grant. Secretary Schurz is as hostile as ever to the latter, and Secretary Schurz speaks for a not inconsiderable number of republicans. But Grant, after all, controls the republican party machinery, and can, we believe, if he desires it—a thing almost certain—secure the nomination.

Senators Blaine and Conkling are, apart from Grant, the strongest men in the republican ranks, but there is between these Goliaths of republicanism a feeling of intense personal bitterness. With the republicans of New England and the South, Blaine would of a certainty be a strong candidate, but Conkling certainly distances him in favor with the republican party in the middle and western States.

Secretary Sherman is also spoken of as a probable candidate. We do not see how he could possibly secure the nomination, as he could not carry his own State.

Amongst the democrats a feeling of deep-seated uneasiness prevails. The recent "split" in New York has certainly weakened the party, and the managers are looking to Horatio Seymour to heal their differences. He has it in his power to do so. If he accepts the nomination himself he will certainly poll an undivided democratic vote, which in his case would mean a large New York majority.

We should not by any means be surprised to see Governor Seymour support the claims of Tilden to re-nomination, and we fail to see any reason why the latter should not

prove as formidable a candidate as ever. But if the latter fail to get the nomination and Seymour declines it, the choice will probably be between Bayard, Hancock, and Hendricks. Either of the three would make a strong candidate, and we should not be surprised to see a combination of the names of Hancock and Hendricks carry the day.

Senator Bayard was certainly the strongest democratic candidate who could be nominated as far as the South is concerned, but almost any candidate on that side can obtain the Southern vote and strength in that section, which means weakness elsewhere.

We shall look with interest to the developments of the discussion. The democrats will have to exercise vigilance and forbearance if they expect to triumph over the well-organized forces of republicanism.

THE LATE PAPAL ENCYCLICAL.

ARTICLE III.

In this third article on the recent Papal Encyclical, we will endeavor to define, as near as we can without being exactly prophets, the various positions scientists and philosophers will take, in relation to the "Philosophical Rule" of Leo XIII. Now, these may be divided into three classes, viz: the open and declared enemies, the would-be and simulated friends, and the sincerely obedient children of the Holy See.

1. The first are those who deny to the Pope the supreme authority of Vicar of Christ, and who have only words of contempt for the wise discipline with which he governs the holy Catholic Church. Of this class are the greater part of the scientists of the age, and not a small portion of the professors of the government-paid colleges and universities of Europe; those, namely, who never speak of God, and treat Him as though He did not exist, and of religion only to scorn it and make war upon it; who, though well versed in experimental sciences, are superlatively ignorant, not only of the true principles of reason, by which all science must be governed, but also of the fundamental principles of the Catholic faith, who consequently affirm that there is necessary antagonism between reason and faith, and that the latter must be sacrificed to the former; who, in fine, without any reason, and altogether *a priori*, condemn everything Catholic, and entertain a supreme contempt for Pope and Catholic doctors, Catholic doctrine and Catholic morals, etc. . . .

Now all these are simply epicureans, both in speculation and in practice, and hence it is not very difficult to foretell what sort of a reception they have in store for Pope Leo's Philosophical Rule. They will, as a matter of course, deny to the Pope the right of having anything to say in philosophy at all; they will call him an enemy of human reason, and declare his encyclical a monument of ancient barbarism and tyrannical despotism. Professing a boundless tolerance for all errors and for those who advocate them, and finding truth alone intolerable, the men of this stamp will receive with applause all the stupidities published by every charlatan decorated with the title of philosopher; they will land to the skies those governments that will banish religion from the schools.

But let the Pope, making use of his supreme authority, command that pure doctrines be taught the Catholic youth, from the chairs of Catholic schools, and their rage against the Vicar of Jesus Christ will know neither bounds nor limits. If the Pope had praised the doctrines of Epicure, if he had proposed for universal master of philosophy a Descartes, a Spinoza, a Locke, a Kant, a Hegel, or anyone else professing Atheism or the most abject materialism, or any other beastly system, what praises he would have obtained from the vile herd of modern epicureans! Why, Leo XIII. would have been saluted as the greatest genius of the century, who, having broken the chains of intellectual thralldom, had dared at last to restore human thought to its natural liberty, and thus opened for Catholics an era of unlimited progress; but that he should propose for the Catholic

schools the teaching of the scholastic doctrines of Aquinas, what a horror! what a monstrosity!

In vain does the August Pontiff demonstrate, by many irrefragable arguments, the sublimity of the wisdom of St. Thomas, the safety of his doctrines, the immense reputation he enjoyed with learned men in past centuries; with those who are willfully blind, and determined not to listen to any reasons, all his efforts will be of no avail; they are fully resolved upon destroying the Catholic religion, and to use for that purpose education, and especially the teaching of philosophy. The Encyclical "Eterni Patris" will not cause them to deviate even a hair's breadth from the course they intend to pursue; we might as well expect the torrent to rush back towards its source, than to dare hope for better things from men like these.

11. The would-be simulated friends are those who, unwilling to abandon their cherished systems and opinions, would yet, at the same time, have it appear that they are not opposed to the wishes of the Holy Father, as expressed in his recent Encyclical. Their obedience is a simulated and disloyal one, and is calculated to do much harm, because secret rebellion in the camp is worse by far than an open and declared enemy. We will, therefore, in advance, endeavour to answer some of the sophisms by which this class of philosophers will be found trying to deceive themselves and the world.

1. Unlike the open and declared adversaries of the Apostolic See, who falsely assert that Leo XIII. has raised to the dignity of dogmas of faith all the philosophical sayings of St. Thomas, they, on the contrary, deny that the Holy Father dogmatically defined any of the propositions, which, taken in their ensemble, constitute the philosophical system of the scholastic school, and that therefore the contrary propositions may be held and taught without rendering oneself liable to censure.

Here is our answer to this first sophism: True enough, Pope Leo has not, in his Encyclical, raised any of the philosophical propositions of St. Thomas to the dignity of dogmas of faith; but what Leo XIII. did not do has been done by more than one council of the church. Besides, many of the philosophical principles of St. Thomas are most intimately connected with dogmas of faith, and many more stand irrefragably demonstrated in the light of human reason; and none therefore dare with impunity teach the contrary propositions of any belonging to these three orders, the affirmations of our would-be and simulated friends to the contrary notwithstanding.

2. In the second place, they will say, Leo XIII. has particularized nothing in his Encyclical; when he tells us to follow the philosophy of Aquinas, he does not say which portions of his system are to be held as fundamental, and which are only of secondary importance; hence, full liberty to everyone to accept of St. Thomas just as much as he pleases, and to oppose and reject the rest. Thus, as far as scientists are concerned, the situation has not been changed by the Papal Encyclical. Holding all the propositions that have been at any time defined as dogmas of faith, we have things pretty much as they were before, viz: in *necessaria unitas* and in *dubia libertas*—in things necessary, unity; in things doubtful, liberty.

To this we answer that it is false to say that the Pope, in endeavoring to inculcate the philosophical principles of Aquinas, has not particularized. Just read carefully the following words of the Encyclical: "There is no part of philosophy which he has not acutely and also solidly handled. Of the laws of reasoning, of God and incorporeal substances, of man and other sensible things, of human actions and their principles, he has discoursed in such a manner, that there is nothing wanting in him, either as respects the abundant number of questions, the fit arrangement of the members, the best method of procedure, the soundings of the principles, the strength of the arguments, the perspicuity and propriety of expression, and the facility of explaining whatever is abstruse." And a little further on, speaking of

the powerful influence of philosophy upon the study of physics, he says: "For the consideration of facts and the observation of nature are not alone sufficient for the fruitful exercise and advancement of this study; but when the facts have been established, one must rise higher, labor diligently to investigate the nature of corporeal things, to discover the laws which they obey, and the principles whence they derive their order, their unity in variety, and their mutual affinity in diversity. To which investigations it is wonderful what light and powerful aid is afforded by scholastic philosophy, if it be wisely handled. In these passages there is a clear indication of some of the fundamental principles of the scholastic philosophy. If these be rejected, and other principles that are diametrically opposed to them be taught, the scholastic system exists no longer.

3. The Holy Father, they will say, prescribes in substance an eclectic system of philosophy, since he tells us to embrace everything that may have been wisely said by Descartes, Mallebranche, Gioberti, Rosmini, even Tyndall and others of that ilk. Our answer to this is, that it is simply ridiculous. One struck with blindness can see that the Holy Father prescribes the teaching of the philosophy of St. Thomas and not any body else's. Yet, as already said, to receive from others truths not expressly, though virtually contained in the writings of the angelic doctor, would not be tantamount to changing the nature of his philosophic system, no more than the addition of ever so many explanatory appendices to Euclid would be equivalent to a change of the ancient system of geometry.

4. In the fourth place, Pope Leo, they say, plainly tells us that he does not intend to impose on the world those parts of the ancient philosophy which have been proved false. Therefore, from the sum of the propositions which constitute the philosophy of St. Thomas, we must renege all those which have been rejected as false by modern scientists, in comparison to whom the old philosophers were but as children, groping their way through the scientific fields.

To which we answer that we admit that Leo XIII. has said, and wisely, that he did not intend that anything believed as true by the ancients, but proved to be false by true science, ought to be accepted by us; but the conclusion drawn from this by our would-be Catholic philosophers we cannot admit, viz., that therefore we must abandon all those propositions which have been rejected as false by modern scientists.

What right have they, the contempters of the wisdom of our fathers, to impose on us the authority of their lying testimony? What have they to give us in exchange for solid truth? Bare affirmations without any proofs, hypotheses without a shadow of demonstration, affirmations and hypotheses often contradictory, sometimes manifestly absurd and impious, even ridiculous and foolish. Have we not seen them, these so-called scientists, apostles of modern incredulity, in the height of their pride, declare in the name of science the abolition of religion and the annihilation of God? Have we not seen them, forgetting the true principles of Aristotle and Aquinas, plunge themselves into the pestilential sloughs of epicureanism? It is to us as clear as day, that the only reason why the fundamental principles of St. Thomas are condemned as false by the modern scientists, is, because they are opposed to all the beastly systems now-a-days in vogue amongst them. But this reason will not satisfy us; we want more than bare affirmations; we must have demonstrations, and these they cannot produce, simply because it is impossible.

5. Again, some of them will say, the philosophy that the Holy Father intends to propose is a christian philosophy, therefore let us distinguish in Aquinas the Catholic doctrine compiling the sublime wisdom of the Fathers of the church from the slavish follower of the pagan Aristotle, and let us drop in him all that comes from pagan sources, and hold fast only to that which he received from the fathers, because to that the

true christian philosophy must be reduced.

Our answer to this is, that Pope Leo proposes the christian philosophy not in general; but as it has been compiled and propounded by St. Thomas. Truth is like gold; we accept it, as the Holy Father says, with gratitude, from whomsoever it offers it, be he Augustine or Aristotle. For the rest, for genius, love of truth and soundness of doctrine, Aristotle very much surpasses the greatest part of the heterodox and anti-scholastic philosophers of the modern schools.

6. It is true enough, some of them will finally say, that we are commanded to follow the philosophy of St. Thomas, but the Holy Father has not given us any determined interpretation of the same to which we ought to hold fast, to the exclusion of any other. We see, therefore, no difficulty in accepting the angelic doctor, so long as we may interpret him as we please.

To this we answer that the Holy Father has given us a criterion by which we may be enabled to learn the true doctrine of St. Thomas, and shun that which is falsely ascribed to him: "Take care," says Pope Leo in his Encyclical, "that suppositions may not be received as truths, nor things erroneous as sound, take care that the wisdom of St. Thomas shall be drawn from its very sources, or at least from those streams which, derived from the original source, still flow clear and pure, according to the certain and unanimous opinion of learned men. But see to it that the minds of youth be kept back from those currents which some say flowed thence, but which in reality are strange and unwholesome waters."

11. It is certainly a cause of profound grief and deep sorrow to the Vicar of Christ to see the open and declared enemies of the church rage and blaspheme because of the Philosophical Rule, and still more so to know that even some of those who profess to love him and acknowledge him as the universal doctor of the Catholic church are endeavoring to render inefficacious, as far as they can, this same Philosophical Rule. Still his heart is also rejoiced to see the greater part of Catholic doctors making echo to the voice of the whole Catholic Episcopate, rejoice that God in these times of general corruption has been pleased to inspire the supreme pastor of the church with wisdom and fortitude to discover and recommend the most proper means to cure these powerful evils in their very root. It is, therefore, not merely hoped that the greater part of Catholic doctors are going to give a favorable reception to the Philosophical Rule; it is even now a patent and accomplished fact. They all unanimously acknowledge that the Pope has the right to regulate Catholic education, and more especially the study of philosophy, which has so many points of contact with theology, and which, if not the friend and handmaid of faith, becomes necessarily its enemy; that although he may not dogmatically define a given doctrine, it ought to be taught the moment he desires it, to the exclusion of the contrary, that it is a miserable sophism to say that since the Pope has not determined what particular propositions of St. Thomas are fundamental, it is therefore left free to any one to take and leave just whatever he pleases; that, finally, in order to be a follower of St. Thomas in the sense recommended by the Encyclical "Eterni Patris," one must, as a matter of course, accept all those principles which constitute the scholastic system of philosophy.

We will terminate our remarks on the Papal Encyclical by refuting just one more sophism. They say the Pope, in undertaking the reform of philosophy, forgets altogether to mention the physical sciences, and therefore the student of physics may without any scruples continue in the old beaten track. We admit that the Encyclical does not treat *ex professo* of the reformation of the study of physical sciences, still the Holy Father is not without alluding to them, when he speaks of the influence of philosophy on physics, as we have indicated above. And who but knows that in our days the destruction of faith has been